

San Juan Initiative Policy Group Meeting

The Grange, Friday Harbor

June 25, 2007

1:15-4:30

Meeting Notes – Final Approved

Policy Members Present:

Lincoln Bormann,
Pete Kilpatrick,
Kit Rawson,
Fayette Krause,
Kevin Ranker,
Patty Miller,

Nick Jones,
Lynn Bahrych,
Steve Simpson,
Elizabeth Babcock,
Ron Zee,
Jeri Ahrenius

Bernie Hargrave,
Jonathan White,
Lisa Byers,
Sam Buck,
Liz Illg

Staff: Jim Kramer, Carol MacIlroy, Amy Windrope

Audience: Laura Arnold, Jody Kennedy, Barbara Rosenkotter, Jack Cory, Stephanie Buffum-Field

Decisions from Meeting:

Meeting notes approved from June 13th and May 21st.

Summary of Key Points from Meeting:

- Marine Resources Committee requested that the Policy Group choose priorities two and five to further the work of the Marine Stewardship Area Plan.
- General Concern that water quantity and quality issues are not being addressed adequately at County level. Concerned that affordability around water quantity and quality is not rising to the top in discussions.
- Would like to have more time at next meeting to discuss in depth the issues presented from technical review and the information that will be presented by the science review.

Priority Threats as of June 25 meeting:

2. Threats to marine nearshore habitats and shoreline functions associated with San Juan County shoreline development.
3. Threats to terrestrial habitat quantity and quality, loss of native biodiversity and rare ecological communities due to loss of habitat, loss of connectivity of habitat associated with single family residential development.
5. Threats to marine water quality associated with increases in stormwater run-off, increase in land based toxic and increase in water based toxics from boaters and catastrophic oil spill.

Further Discussion:

6. Threats to surface water processes including alteration of stream flow, increase in impoundments, degradation of wetlands and changes to land cover due to the cumulative impacts of development.
7. Threats to aquifer recharge areas associated with increases in impervious surfaces, conversion of aquifer recharge areas to development and proliferation of private wells.
Threat 1 subset: Address rockfish abundance and the voluntary rockfish closures.

At the conclusion of the June 25 meeting, Policy Group members requested the following information:

- The Policy Group would like to hear priorities from each of the individual regional managers that sit on the Policy Group. Through participation in the coming meeting, the regional managers can provide this information.
- Better understanding of why Karin Agosta, Shireene Hale, Ron Henrickson, Vicki Heater, and Laura Arnold were chosen to address gaps and opportunities in protection.
- Information regarding rockfish population status.
- Public involvement plan.
- Understanding of how assessment will be executed for top priority threats.
- Meeting protocols and decision making agreements
- Barbara will provide list of issues identified in her work that are not being addressed.
- Survey of public from Puget Sound Partnership.

Staff will provide this information before the next meeting.

Next Meeting

- Decision on priority threats
- Who facilitates the next series of meetings?

Detailed Notes

IMPRESSIONS OF JUNE 13TH MEETING:

Doug Sutherland's comment about clean-up of the bay – can't solve problems at the end of the line- have to solve the problem locally with outreach and real solutions.

Very helpful meeting; first time having key state leaders here in the San Juans talking about the San Juans.

Enjoyed the meeting- really enjoyed having the ear of some of those people- could bounce some ideas off of them; it was nice.

Agencies seem too comfortable in dealing with their part of it; didn't potentially need partners, our role may be to make them less comfortable?

Heard them say they could think outside the box – was a significant offer; really opened some doors and they are good doors to walk through. Committed to showing up for that meeting; really willing to listen and try and work with this process; this is good; did not get that they want to be the innovators; they are looking to us for this; have a bit of a gap between how things work locally and how things work at the larger scale; hard to get people to collaborate really;

Choosing just a few focused issues sounds is a strategic choice to make concrete progress. There is continued interest in a broader discussion of ecosystem health and an index for the whole human/natural community.

I can see strong logic in picking one or two issues and looking through a new filter; if crafting as a demonstration- each group starts out with same confidence and then it doesn't work- need to be able to change course. We need to document what did and didn't work- need to do this through-out the process. How do we close the gap between what Bill's survey said and the reality. Like what Krystyna said, we need a communication plan- need to really focus on outreach.

We could consider contracting with communications group – want to engage the community in what is the problem- is the distinct skill set.

TECHNICAL FEEDBACK

We don't need to get a lot of feedback from others to choose the priorities- we represent the islands- we don't want to get lost in the minutia- we will just get more and more data and becomes this sluggish thing; want this to be a rapid-fire thing. What was clear from the agency perspective is that they don't get good feedback.

MRC request from Kit:

Kit- The Marine Stewardship Area Plan is voluntary- but to achieve what we want to achieve, the MRC needs to think more broadly- Initiative is a way to analyze how the suite of protection tools could reduce various threats- the regulatory work is out of the MRC purview, we need the analysis to advance these issues.

200 people attended meetings that informed the MRC results and priorities.

Is the gap a result of the solutions being outside of your purview or is it because of bringing together diverse groups?

There is concern that threat 1 is not being addressed adequately by the MRC.

Kit- Number 1 is important and relates to our strategies- especially to the third strategy- it is his personal feeling that Initiative could be more helpful on 2 and 5 than on 1. The MRC priorities came from 35 strategies that were taken to the public for prioritization at a series of workshops on each ferry served island.

Jody: Went through a long technical review- rigorous process; ranked threats across the ecosystem; #2 is the highest threat after climate change and oil spills

Laura: regulatory gap analysis has not been done and is a critical next step in determining implementation for the MSA

The Policy Group divided into three breakout groups and was tasked with ranking the threats based on two criteria:

1. Significance to local community
2. Overall, taking into account local community significance and policy/technical review.

The groups were as follows:

Group 1:

Steve, Lisa, Nick, Lynn, Patty and Sam.

Note Taker: Carol

Rankings: 2,3,5.

Comment: Overlap of issues made choosing difficult

Group 2:

Kit, Fayette, Lincoln, Liz and Kevin

Note Taker: Jody

Ranking: 2,3,5.

Everyone agreed on 5 as a high for both community and overall categories. 2 and 3 are high overall.

3 is high for the community; people are concerned about changes to the landscape, loss of open space, and so on...logging is also an issue. The community does not like logging and the potential for greater logging impact is a real threat.

2 – Group disagrees on whether 2 is high or medium for the community. Most of the group is leaning toward medium because they feel the community is more concerned about terrestrial habitat than marine. It has more of a direct impact on them.

Group 3:

Ron, Jonathan, Bernie, Elizabeth, Jeri, Amy

Note Taker: Barbara

Ranking: 2,3,5. But would like to see 6 included.

This group is interested in tackling rockfish fishing regulation and enforcement but not all of 1. This group sees 1 as important to community. See 2 and 3 as linked, 5 and 6 linked and 6 and 3 linked. Hope that by taking on 2,3, 5 and maybe 6, many of the threats listed would be addressed peripherally.